| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | 10/608,291 | NGUYEN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | George Suchfield | 3676 | |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: pending | | |
| (1) George Suchfield. | (3) | | |
| (2) Robert A. Kent. | (4) | | |
| Date of Interview: 8 December 2005 | er 2005 Time: Eastern Standard, p.m. | | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appl Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: . | olicant's representative) | | |
| Part I. | | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: 35 USC 102 | | | |
| Claims discussed: 1 and new claim 73 | | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: Cooke, Jr. (2003/0060374) | | | |
| Part II. | | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GE See Continuation Sheet | NERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS | S DISCUSSED: | |
| Part III. | | | |
| It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separal directly resulted in the allowance of the application. of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separal did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summ | The examiner will provide a writt ate record of the substance of the | en summary of the substance interview, since the interview | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applic | cant/Applicant's Representative S | ignature – if appropriate) | |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was indicated by the examiner that new claim 73 appeared to read on the reference to Cooke, Jr.'374, applied in the previous Office action, insofar as the degradable pellet of Cooke, Jr. appeared to comprise or read on the recited "degradable composite material" (note, e.g., Para [0030] on page 5). The examiner further indicated the amendment to claim 1 wherein the degradable material is now limited to "one or more poly(orthoesters)" was still under consideration, whereupon the attorney emphasized the arguments/traversal set forth in the REMARKS of the amendment, most specifically, that the Anton Skrabal & Otto Ringer reference, with accompanying translation, noted on page 13, provided evidence/explanation that the/a "poly(orthoester)" possessed the chemical structure and properties/reactiveness of an ether, rather than an ester, and thus patentably distinguishes over the reference to Cooke, Jr., and other cited/applied references. No agreement was reached, however, applicant's attorney gave the examiner authorization to amend new claim 73 to include the same claim 1 limitation: "that comprises one or more poly(otheresters)", in the event the examiner did determine claim 1 to be allowable..